

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 954

CG 015 185

AUTHOR Kuh, George D.; Walsh, Esther
TITLE An Assessment of the Learning Disposition of Resident Students at Indiana University-Bloomington.
PUB DATE 1 Feb 80
NOTE 38p.; Appendix B not filmed due to marginal reproducibility.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Environment; *College Housing; Dormitories; *Group Experience; Higher Education; *On Campus Students; *Resident Assistants; *Role Perception; Student Development; Student Needs; *Student Personnel Services

IDENTIFIERS *Indiana University

ABSTRACT

Because residence life supplements the students' classroom experiences with personal and group learning related to cognitive, affective, and physical development, the appropriate role for residential living units in the Indiana University community was explored. The learning disposition of students living in the residence halls was examined, including students' acclimation to different life styles, interpersonal relationships, study habits, individual responsibility, sensitivity to cultural differences, social skills, and academic performance. Residents (N=285) and residence life staff (N=18) randomly selected from three residence centers completed interviews or evaluation questionnaires. Results showed that, although study conditions in the halls were reported as satisfactory, students who earned higher grades studied more and at different locations than their rooms. Many residents were uncertain as to whether residence life staff and programs could or should influence certain dimensions of their learning disposition. Many students did not appear interested in expending the effort to increase their functioning along many of the dimensions although the behaviors were considered important. The majority of residents reported that activities related to the learning disposition dimensions and increased study time were not appropriate foci for residence life staff. (NRB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED 201 934

An Assessment of the Learning Disposition
of Resident Students at Indiana University - Bloomington

by
George D. Kuh
and
Esther Walsh

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

George D. Kuh

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

February 1, 1980

The authors wish to acknowledge the contributions of the students named below in the U550 Seminar, Evaluation in Student Affairs, for their help in collecting the data presented in this report.

R. Bradley, J. Compton, H. Letafat, R. Parrent,
A. Phelan, S. Richter, and P. Volp.

CG 0151 85

An Assessment of the Learning Disposition
of Resident Students at Indiana University - Bloomington

During recent months, the appropriate role for residential living units in the Indiana University community has come under scrutiny. Dr. John Schuh, Director of the Department of Residence Life, authorized an evaluation of certain aspects of the Department for at least three reasons:

1. The coming decade of decline in the number and changing characteristics of traditional-aged college students suggests a reexamination may be needed of the residence hall uses and staffing;
2. Some faculty and certain administrators have questioned whether residence hall programs and services complement or enhance the learning process;
3. A systematic evaluation of the Department of Residence Life has not been conducted in the recent past by an external (to the Department) agency.

While the Halls of Residence as an administrative structure exists primarily to provide shelter and sustenance for students, the Department of Residence Life supplements the in-class experiences of students with personal and group learning experiences that are thought to be related to cognitive, affective, and physical development. The Department purports to meet students' needs and stimulate student development through a variety of policies, programs, and activities. Considering the breadth of activities in which the Department is engaged, the diversity that

characterizes the undergraduate population and therefore the respective living units, and the time constraints within which the evaluation team had to operate, the Department's activities were not evaluated in their entirety. In the following paragraphs, the scope, specific objectives, and questions pertinent to the evaluation are outlined. While this activity was a project for a graduate seminar in evaluation, the evaluation itself was authentic.

Background Information

Objective of the Evaluation

The evaluation was conducted to describe the learning disposition of students living in the residence halls. Learning disposition included students' acclimation to and appreciation and exploration of different life styles; appropriate experience with different types of interpersonal relationships; evidence of appropriate study habits, individual responsibility, sensitivity to cultural differences, and social skills; and satisfactory academic performance in the traditional sense (grade point average).

Description of the Department of Residence Life

To place the evaluation in the proper perspective, the evaluation team reviewed the following materials: The Key, the Department of Residence Life "Staff Manuals," Residence Hall Options at Indiana University, results from the Fall 1979 Ecosystem Survey, and information about grade point averages by hall for the preceding year.

The Department of Residence Life strives to integrate and enrich the living and learning environment of each student by providing academic,

cultural, social, and recreational programming within a community atmosphere.

Objectives:

1. To provide for the successful development of those tasks which characterize growth in young adults;
2. To maintain an environment in which students are encouraged to integrate their personal and academic lives;
3. To develop characteristics of a community that educationally benefits all students;
4. To support institutional objectives by maintaining an orderly environment in accordance with state laws;
5. To facilitate communication within the Department;
6. To maintain cooperative contacts with all other relevant institutional offices (e.g., IUPD, CAPS, University Division).

Rules and Regulations. All the rules, procedures, and policies pertaining to the Department of Residence Life may be found in The Key, and the departmental staff manuals. These rules, procedures, and policies support the belief that learning occurs through appropriate interaction with others in the University community.

Other. Indiana University - Bloomington is a residential campus located in the small, urban community of Bloomington. Although a number of students choose to live off campus, a majority of students' living needs are met through residence hall complexes or fraternity and sorority houses.

As Chamberlain stated in Evaluation in Student Affairs (Kuh, 1979), "there is a diversity in the age, type, and size of residence halls available to students on the Indiana campus. The range from older

smaller units, built prior to World War II to large, multistoried modern designed structures, built during the growth years of the 1950's and 1960's."

There are 10 undergraduate residence halls located in three "tri-quads," a term used to designate three halls in close proximity. One hall, MRC-LLC, is geographically isolated. Approximately 210 Resident Assistants (RA) supervise 10,000 undergraduate students. Each RA is responsible for 30-85 students, depending on the center and the floor location. Assistant Coordinators (AC) supervise a staff of four to ten RAs depending on the hall or floor.

The student turnover or attrition rate from the residence halls is about 50% per year. Students are assigned a room based on various factors, such as: application date, length of time on the campus, and visitation choice. Facilities vary from center to center to meet the needs of the students. Every center maintains a library.

Evaluation Design

Constraints

Decisions concerning the evaluation's scope, implementation, data analysis, and reporting were made by Dr. George Kuh after consultation with Dr. John Schuh and evaluation team members, eight graduate students in education. The timing constraints were inhibiting factors. Because of the composition of the evaluation team (graduate students in an evaluation seminar), the project was conceived and implemented prior to the end of the Fall, 1979, semester. The flexibility and data gathering capacity usually associated with projects like this was attenuated somewhat given that funds were not available to support the project.

Organizational Framework for Evaluation

The evaluation emphasized elements of the Reporter genre of evaluation approaches (see Brown, 1979). That is, the evaluation team endeavored to describe the behavior of undergraduate resident students at Indiana University - Bloomington as it was related to learning disposition. The technologies associated with Reporter-oriented evaluations assume that an accurate portrayal of relevant activities can provide important evaluation information. In essence, the evaluation served to provide a vicarious experience for the Department of Residence Life.

In addition, elements of the Systematic Planner approaches were incorporated (relating objectives to activities, and assessing outcomes).

Evaluation Questions

The overarching issue that served as a guide for the evaluation activity was whether the behavior of resident students was conducive to the acquisition of a favorable learning disposition. More specifically, the project sought answers to two questions: What are the relationships between various resident student characteristics such as residential unit, study habits (where, with whom, how often), and learning disposition? What efforts do students expend to improve their disposition toward learning?

The evaluation team took the position that for residence life staff and programs to be effective, a receptive audience (students) was required. In essence, the project attempted to determine the degree to which resident students at Indiana University - Bloomington were interested in and committed to acquiring a favorable learning disposition.

Method

Sample

The target sample was comprised of residents and residence life staff randomly selected from three residence centers: Forest, Willkie, and Wright. The target centers were selected based on some general criteria of representativeness related to other centers; e.g., active student government, hall grade point average, campus location, and "general ambiance." The degree of "goodness of fit" or representativeness of these particular centers was validated in discussions with Dr. John Schuh and other residence life staff.

The names, addresses, and telephone numbers of residents of each of the three centers were obtained. One hundred students were randomly selected (33 from ~~Foster~~, 33 from Willkie, 34 from Wright--41% male) for telephone interviews. An additional 100 students from each of the centers (total n = 300) were randomly selected for their input via an evaluation questionnaire. Due to sample attrition and exclusion of some resident assistants who were inadvertently included in the list of residents, the target sample was reduced to 285 undergraduate residents (45% male).

Face to face interviews were conducted with each of the center coordinators (n = 3). From each center, about a half dozen assistant coordinators or resident assistants were selected for telephone interviews. The selection of residence life staff was based on several criteria (experience as an RA/AC, length of time in the center). The number of residence life staff including coordinators totaled 18; five from Foster, six from Willkie, and seven from Wright.

Instrumentation and Procedures

The interview protocols and evaluation questionnaires were designed to obtain essentially the same information (see Appendix A). The instruments were developed during September and early October of 1979. After testing the forms in late October with some undergraduate students, the telephone interviews with residents were conducted by seven graduate students during early November, 1979. Interviews were conducted with 75 (43% male) of the 100 students targeted for this portion of the study.

Concurrently, the evaluation questionnaires were developed and sent on November 5 to the 285 randomly selected residents of the three target centers (Appendix B). Also enclosed in the packet sent to these residents was an individually typed and signed letter from Dr. John Schuh explaining the purposes and importance of the project. After Thanksgiving recess, all those who had not responded to the mailed questionnaire were given another set of materials by the RA on their floor and encouraged to participate. A response rate of 57% (41% male) was realized.

This participation level is somewhat lower than should be expected for this type of project. At Indiana University, residents are an often solicited group; that is, they tend to be burdened with questionnaires, etc. Most efforts to poll residents typically fall short of a 50% return rate. Therefore, although not a high response rate was obtained in this project, compared with efforts of this type in the Indiana University campus, the 57% participation rate compares favorably. Nevertheless, the results should be interpreted with some caution.

Results

For reasons of parsimony, the interview data have been combined

with information from the questionnaire. In instances where salient findings represent only one of these data sources, specific reference to the appropriate source is made. The results are reported in several sections: Study Habits and Conditions, Grades, Learning Disposition, and Staff Insights. Prior to presenting the results, a brief summary of demographic information about the respondents is provided.

Demographic Profile of Respondents

The views and behaviors of 98 men and 139 women from three residence centers were the source of the information that follows. Almost a third of the respondents reported majoring in some area of business, with about 10% divided among each of the following fields: natural sciences and health, physical sciences and math, and education. The average age (mode) of respondents was 18. Over 50% were freshmen, about a quarter were sophomores, and almost 17% were juniors. For 99 respondents, the semester in which the study was conducted was their first in the halls. Less than 20% had lived in an IU residence hall more than four semesters. For 139 respondents, this was the first semester they had lived in the center in which they were residing when the study was conducted.

As a group the respondents who had been on campus at least one full semester prior to fall, 1979, reported a cumulative grade point average of 2.8. This is comparable to the cumulative grade point average of resident students at IU - Bloomington.

Study Habits and Conditions

Better than half of the respondents who were interviewed indicated that they study in the evenings between 5:00 p.m. and midnight, Monday

through Thursday. Only half of the students studied at any time on Friday or Sunday, and less than 20% devoted any time to academic matters on Saturday. It was no surprise that the data documented the popular impression that on the weekends resident students suspend their pursuit of truth and knowledge!

The average (mean) number of study hours per week was about 18. The range was from 2 - 68 hours per week. About three quarters studied 20 hours or less. Only 5% spent more than 35 hours engaged in this activity. Students were asked how much they would need to study to achieve their desired grade point average. This estimate of the required number of study hours rose to about 23 hours per week, while the range stayed essentially the same.

Over three quarters of the respondents believed study conditions in their residence hall, particularly their dormitory room, were satisfactory. Indeed, the majority of studying by resident students was done in their residence hall room. Over a third spent more than 75% of their study time in their room. A considerable proportion (over two thirds) studied in the main library. Not quite half of the respondents also used their hall lounge as a study area. Relatively few students studied in academic buildings (11%) or in the monitored study hall located in their resident centers (6%).

It should be noted that the proportion of time spent studying in one's room depends on the degree to which the study conditions in the room are perceived as satisfactory ($r = .39, p < .01$). Also, students who studied fewer hours tended to spend more of their study time in their rooms ($r = .12, p < .08$). The small number of students who found locations

to study other than the usual places such as their room, the library, or other locations in the hall tended to study more ($r = .37, p < .09$).

Grades

Several questions were asked about grades. Respondents reported the grade point average they realistically would like to earn that semester was 3.3 (mean). As a group respondents believed they would receive a mean grade point average of about 3.0. Older students reported higher grade point averages ($r = .32, p < .01$). The more hours respondents studied, the higher their desired, expected, and cumulative grade point average.

Students who said to earn their desired grade point average they would have to study more than they did at present did not do so for various reasons. The greatest proportion reported being "too busy with other things" (e.g., social life and co-curricular activities). Almost a quarter said they lacked motivation, and 10% reported it was "too noisy" in the halls to study effectively.

Learning Disposition

Respondents considered the six dimensions comprising the concept of learning disposition to be important. Most were generally satisfied with their own degree of responsibility, communication skill, and so forth. And many reported a general sense of satisfaction in the degree to which living in the halls facilitated their development along these dimensions. Men tended to be somewhat more dissatisfied with the extent to which living in the halls favorably influenced their ability to communicate effectively and their understanding of and appreciation for women. Compared with their female counterparts, men were quite

satisfied with their personal development concerning cultural activities.

Women tended to be more satisfied than men on most learning disposition dimensions. However, they, too, were not satisfied with the degree to which residence hall living increased the understanding of persons of the opposite sex (men).

Although most respondents thought these dimensions were important, they did not necessarily expend effort to increase their own development along the dimensions. For example, while almost all respondents (98%) believed it was important to act responsibly, only three quarters put forth effort (discussing their behavior with others, seeking help in making important decisions, etc.) to become a more responsible person (Table 1). This phenomenon (i.e., not willing to expend effort even though development was perceived as important) was more graphically portrayed on the dimension associated with developing an understanding of and appreciation for persons from other cultures. While 93% thought that this was an important area of development, only about half made any effort to increase their skill in this area (it should be noted that at the time this project was being conducted, Iran had taken 50 American hostages. This event may have had a limiting effect on the number of persons who might have reported being interested in reaching out to persons from other cultures).

The more effort put forward in all six dimensions related to learning disposition, the more satisfied respondents tended to be with their development on the respective dimensions (r 's range from .19 to .30, all $p < .01$). In Table 2, the proportion of respondents who reported

whether residence life staff and programs should and could influence residents along the various dimensions are reported. Note the diversity in opinion as to the appropriate role of residence life staff and programs. Also note that while respondents were less certain whether residence life staff and programs could be helpful to themselves personally, they were more likely to agree that others in their residence hall certainly could benefit from programs directed toward the various dimensions.

Staff Insights

Responses varied somewhat by staff roles and centers. Coordinators tended to be more articulate. This could be attributed to their experience as full-time professionals and to the fact that their interviews were conducted in person. In general, coordinators responded similarly. However, RAs tended to be more optimistic and positive about residents' behavior and study habits than coordinators. Foster and Willkie staff responses were fairly similar while the views of Wright staff varied. The issue of greatest concern to staff dealt with student responsibility. Reference to students exhibiting responsible behavior was made by all the coordinators.

Willkie staff goals were to provide an environment that encouraged personal development through cultural, educational and social programming. The center was perceived as providing a balance of academic, social, and recreational activities with unit of orientation, participation in the arts, and a weak student government.

Wright staff indicated that their goals were to promote a community living atmosphere emphasizing academic and social interaction. Wright

was seen as an active center, involved in sports, and also unit oriented. Staff reported that not much emphasis had been placed on academic or cultural growth.

The goals of Foster as outlined by their coordinator were to provide residents the opportunity to become involved in informal social and educational opportunities and in personal and community development. Staff tended to agree although they were less specific in their articulation of these goals. Foster was perceived by staff as undergraduate, lower division, and floor oriented with high participation in social and athletic activities.

Study conditions were generally viewed as satisfactory across center staffs. The degree to which students acted responsibly and quiet hours were observed probably accounted for the variance in the reported satisfaction of study conditions. As a group, residence life staff reported that they were committed to their work although the degree of the commitment varied.

Encouraging responsible behavior on the part of students was perceived as quite important. Opinion was divided on the degree to which staff were satisfied with the responsibility exhibited by students. Staff agreed that they should try to help students become more responsible but were not certain whether they could be effective in this role.

Encouraging effective communication, understanding of persons from other cultures, and increasing tolerance for persons with different lifestyles were viewed to be of great importance. Opinion was once again split on the degree of satisfaction with residents' behavior. All three coordinators were somewhat dissatisfied. Most staff agreed that

they could and should expend energies to increase the degree to which residents communicate effectively.

Opinion was split on the issue of encouraging residents to form meaningful interpersonal relationships with persons of the opposite sex. The degree of satisfaction to which this has occurred also varied from very satisfied to somewhat dissatisfied. Nor did respondents agree as to whether the staff could or should assist in this area.

However, encouraging residents to form meaningful interpersonal relationships with persons of the same sex was of great or some importance to those interviewed. The staff was fairly satisfied with residents' behavior in this area, and the majority felt that they could and should assist in this area.

Suggestions for improving the quality of living in the residence centers included: improvement of physical facilities, staff development efforts to increase competence along learning disposition dimensions, increased programming, enforcement of quiet hours, awareness of the multipurpose role of the RA, and improving student government. Coedification was consistently mentioned as potentially facilitative of residents' development along all the learning dimensions.

Implications

The findings from this project suggest several salient implications for those concerned with the efficacy of the department of residence life. First, it must be recognized that there is a great deal of diversity with regard to respondents' perception of what residence life staff and programs can and should do. It seems as though it would be extremely difficult to provide effective programs and services for

students who have quite different expectations of what they need or want.

Another important implication is that it will be difficult and probably impossible for residence life staff (or other student services staff for that matter) to influence students' learning disposition if students themselves are unwilling to expend efforts to develop along these dimensions. That is, if students are not interested in and committed to these areas of development to invest their own time and energy in the pursuit of these personal objectives, it does not seem likely that other agencies or persons will be able to favorably influence students.

This is particularly true of the amount of time students spend studying. It was not surprising that students who tended to study more reported higher grades. Yet many students who readily admitted they probably would not achieve their desired grade point average apparently were not willing to commit more study time per week. Of course, for some students more study time may merely bring them closer to a point of diminishing returns. However, most students could probably benefit from devoting more out-of-class time to academic matters.

A good deal of concern has been expressed over the environment of the resident centers as it relates to effective habits and academic and personal development. A number of respondents did express disappointment that quiet hours were not enforced with more regularity and resolve. However, those students who reported conditions to be adequate for studying in their room tended to have lower grade point averages and were less interested in pursuing development along other

learning disposition dimensions. While the environments of the halls could and should be made more conducive for studying, it is unlikely that such efforts will be related to appreciable changes in student attitudes and performance. Changes along these dimensions (hours per week spent studying and grade point average) are more likely to be influenced by, for example, attracting different types of students to IU - Bloomington; those who are more highly motivated to achieve in an academic and a personal development sense.

This interpretation is tempered somewhat by the realization that as students become older, they tend to study more and earn higher grades. This phenomenon is probably related to the clearer sense of purpose concomitant with physical and emotional maturation. Because greater numbers of older students tend to live out of the halls, it may be unrealistic to assume increased learning disposition of residents given the clientele who choose to live in the halls (i.e., younger students new to IU - Bloomington). It also should be acknowledged that as the next decade unfolds, more less able students are likely to attend institutions like IU - Bloomington. The implications of this trend are discussed elsewhere (see Kuh, in press). Suffice it to say that more pressures will be placed on residence life staff to provide an environment consistent with the ideals of the university yet realistic given the changing characteristics of students (different motivation, lower ability, lower aspirations, etc.) that will enroll in the next few years.

A more pervasive problem and one that is likely to continue is the great diversity in student expectations concerning what residence life

staff and programs could and should do. The interview data suggested at least three reasons for this diversity. First, many students recognize that development of a favorable learning disposition was a personal issue to be successfully resolved by the individuals, not by the institution through the arm of residence life staff and programs. Second, some students did not assign the same degree of importance to issues surrounding learning disposition. Last, other students did not perceive this (facilitating development along learning disposition dimensions) to be the role of residence life staff. No matter which of these interpretations has the greatest explanatory power, the fact remains that the function of residence life staff and programs is not necessarily appreciated in a personal way by many resident students. However, most students did believe that a majority of residents other than themselves could benefit from activities that addressed the six learning disposition dimensions.

It may be that residence life staff and programs are not effectively communicating their roles and responsibilities to residents. Indeed, there is even some disagreement among staff as to what they can and should do. Of course, some residents will not take advantage of residence life staff or programs no matter how they are articulated or presented. However, it is possible that ongoing orientation of students to the role of resident assistants, orientation assistants, and coordinators and assistant coordinators is needed. Often these roles are described during the first few days on campus when students do not recognize the need for or have been overwhelmed with too much information to appropriately assimilate the roles of residence life staff.

Staff may also benefit from periodic assessment of appropriate roles and activities. No doubt other explanations and strategies can be identified that can help to ameliorate this situation.

Well under half of the respondents in this project reported that activities related to the learning disposition dimensions and increased study time were not appropriate foci for residence life staff and programs. For the department of residence life to favorably enhance the learning environment and influence students along these dimensions, this paradox will have to be addressed.

Table 1

Respondents' Perceptions of Issues Related to
Development of a Favorable Learning Disposition

Dimensions	Importance				Satisfied With One's Own				Efforts to Improve				Has Living in Center Helped		
	Great	Some %	Little	None	Very	Some Sat.	Some Dissat. %	Very Dissat.	Often	Occas.	Rarely %	Never	A Great Deal	A Little %	Not at All
Sense of Responsibility	82	16	1	1	40	52	8	0	42	34	22	2	48	42	10
Ability to Communicate	87	12	1	0	29	59	11	1	46	33	14	7	48	42	10
Understanding Others' Cultures	48	45	4	3	18	63	17	2	22	30	39	9	29	50	21
Tolerance of Different Lifestyles	54	38	7	1	28	62	8	2	46	30	20	4	55	36	9
Capacity for Interaction--Opposite Sex	77	20	3	0	42	44	12	2	52	32	14	2	42	38	20
Capacity for Interaction--Same Sex	79	20	1	0	65	31	3	1	73	20	6	1	66	26	8

n = 238

Table 2

Perceived Role of Residence Life in Facilitating
Development Along Learning Disposition Dimensions

Dimensions	Residence Life Staff and Programs COULD...			Residence Life Staff and Programs SHOULD...			Others Might Benefit From Programs Designed to...		
	Uncertain			Uncertain			Uncertain		
	Yes	%	No	Yes	%	No	Yes	%	No
Increase Sense of Responsibility	33	28	39	42	24	34	75	8	17
Increase Ability to Communicate	42	28	30	42	28	30	76	12	12
Facilitate Understanding of Persons from Different Cultures	55	24	21	47	27	26	80	12	8
Increase Tolerance of Persons with Different Lifestyles	47	21	32	45	24	31	64	16	20
Increase Capacity for Meaningful Interaction with Opposite Sex	34	17	49	29	17	44	52	15	33
Increase Capacity for Meaningful Interaction with Same Sex	49	17	34	41	21	38	68	3	29

n = 238

Appendix A

Key

2 = Wilkie 23
3 = Wright 1
1 = M
2 = F

ID (1-2) (1) is Center (2-3) is ID

Name _____ Sex (4) _____

Telephone _____ Living Unit _____

I have a couple of questions of a general nature about you.

1. How old are you? (5-6) _____
2. What is your class standing? (7) _____
1 Freshman 2 Sophomore 3 Junior 4 Senior 5 Other
3. What is your present (or for freshman) intended major? (8-9) _____
see Acc - Ed sheet
4. For how many semesters have you lived in (name of center)? (10) _____
5. (FOR UPPERCLASSMEN) How many years have you lived in residence halls at IU? (11) _____

I have several questions about grades.

6. What GPA would you realistically like to achieve this semester? (12-14) _____ (desired g)
 7. What is the GPA you expect to earn this semester? (15-17) _____
 8. (FOR UPPERCLASSMEN) What is your cumulative GPA to date? (18-20) _____
-
9. About how many hours per week do you study? (21-22) _____
 10. About how many hours per week would you need to study to achieve your desired GPA? (23-24) _____
 11. If a difference between 9 and 10, what keeps you from studying more? (25) _____
see attached
 12. With whom, if anyone, do you study? (26) _____
see questionnaire

2

13. Where do you study? (Encourage a complete response) - Check as many as apply:

27-28 my residence hall room 37-38 Union

29-30 my residence hall library 39-40 academic building

31-32 my residence hall lounge 41-42 main library

33-34 friend's hall room 43-44 another center (which one?) _____

35-36 residence hall study hall 45-46 other location (please specify) _____

14. What proportion of your study time do you spend in each of these (above) locations? (Write percentage in above spaces)

15. (IF NOT 0% FOR RESIDENCE HALL LOCATIONS) When do you usually study (days, time of day, etc.)? (47-53)

Days see attached

Time of day see attached

16. How satisfactory are the conditions for studying in your room? (51)

1 Very Satisfactory 2 Satisfactory 3 Unsatisfactory

17. If "unsatisfactory" to #17, what must be changed to improve study conditions? _____

18. If unsatisfactory to #17, what can residence life staff do to improve these circumstances? _____

We are about halfway through the interview. I have some questions of a general nature to which you can answer something like the following: A Good Deal, A Little, Not at All; Very Satisfied, Somewhat Satisfied, Somewhat Dissatisfied, Very Dissatisfied, and so forth.

3

19. How important to you is acting responsibly (in terms of respecting others' belongings, studying enough, etc.)? (55)
1 Of great importance 2 Of some import 3 Of little import 4 Of no import
20. How satisfied are you with your own sense of responsibility? (56)
1 Very satisfied 2 Somewhat satisfied 3 Somewhat dissatisfied
4 Very dissatisfied
21. How often do you expend effort or attempt to do things that will help you become a more responsible person in making decisions, etc.)? (57)
1 Very often 2 Often 3 Occasionally 4 Never
22. To what extent has living in (name of center) increased your sense of responsibility (being responsible for your own behavior concerning studying, respect for personal belongings of others, and so forth)? (58)
1 A good deal 2 A little 3 Not at all
23. Could residence life staff and programs assist you in increasing your sense of responsibility? (59)
1 Yes 2 No 3 Uncertain
24. SHOULD residence life staff and programs assist you in increasing your sense of responsibility? (60)
1 Yes 2 No 3 Uncertain
25. What about others in your center—could they benefit? (61)
1 Yes 2 No 3 Uncertain
26. What suggestions do you have for the University that would help facilitate development of a strong sense of responsibility? _____

27. How important to you is being able to communicate effectively? (62)
1 Of great importance 2 Of some import 3 Of little import 4 Of no import

4

28. How satisfied are you with the communication skills you presently have? (63)
1 Very satisfied 2 Somewhat satisfied 3 Somewhat dissatisfied
4 Very dissatisfied
29. How often do you expend effort to become a more effective communicator? (64)
1 Very often 2 Often 3 Occasionally 4 Never
30. To what extent has living in (name of center) increased your ability to communicate effectively with others? (65)
1 A good deal 2 A little 3 Not at all
31. Could residence life staff and programs assist you in increasing your ability to communicate effectively? (66)
1 Yes 2 No 3 Uncertain
32. SHOULD residence life staff and programs assist you in increasing your ability to communicate effectively? (67)
1 Yes 2 No 3 Uncertain
33. What about other students in your center--could they benefit? (68)
1 Yes 2 No 3 Uncertain
34. What suggestions do you have for the University that would help you become a more effective communicator? _____

35. How important to you is being able to understand and appreciate persons from cultures different from your own? (69)
1 Of great importance 2 Of some import 3 Of little import 4 Of no import
36. How satisfied are you with your development in this area? (70)
1 Very satisfied 2 Somewhat satisfied 3 Somewhat dissatisfied
4 Very dissatisfied
37. How often do you expend efforts to become more understanding of persons from other cultures? (71)
1 Very often 2 Often 3 Occasionally 4 Never

38. To what extent has living in (name of center) increased your understanding of persons from cultures different from your own? (72)
1 A good deal 2 A little 3 Not at all
39. Could residence life staff and programs assist you in becoming more understanding of persons from other cultures? (73)
1 Yes 2 No 3 Uncertain
40. SHOULD residence life staff and programs assist you in becoming more understanding of persons from other cultures? (74)
1 Yes 2 No 3 Uncertain
41. What about other students in your center--could they benefit?
1 Yes 2 No 3 Uncertain (75)
42. What suggestions do you have for the University that would help facilitate your understanding of persons from cultures different than yours?

Repeat ID in column 1-3

43. How important to you is becoming more tolerant of persons with lifestyles different from your own? (10)
1 Of great importance 2 Of some import 3 Of little import
4 Of no import
44. How satisfied are you with your development in this area? (11)
1 Very satisfied 2 Somewhat satisfied 3 Somewhat dissatisfied
4 Very dissatisfied
45. How often do you expend effort to become more tolerant of persons with different lifestyles? (12)
1 Very often 2 Often 3 Occasionally 4 Never
46. To what extent has living in (name of center) increased your tolerance for individuals with lifestyles different from your own? (13)
1 A good deal 2 A little 3 Not at all
47. Could residence hall staff and programs be designed to assist you in increasing your tolerance for persons with different lifestyles? (14)
1 Yes 2 No 3 Uncertain

48. SHOULD residence hall staff and programs be designed to assist you in increasing your tolerance for persons with different lifestyles? (15)

1 Yes 2 No 3 Uncertain

49. What about other students—could they benefit? (16)

1 Yes 2 No 3 Uncertain

50. What suggestions do you have for the University that would help facilitate your understanding of persons with lifestyles different from yours?
- _____
- _____

51. How important to you is learning to form meaningful interpersonal relationships with members of the opposite sex? (17)

1 Of great importance 2 Of some import 3 Of little import 4 Of no import

52. How satisfied are you with your development in this area? (18)

1 Very satisfied 2 Somewhat satisfied 3 Somewhat dissatisfied
4 Very dissatisfied

53. How often do you expend effort to relate in a sincere, meaningful way with members of the opposite sex? (19)

1 Very often 2 Often 3 Occasionally 4 Never

54. To what extent has living in (name of center) increased your capacity to form meaningful relationships with members of the opposite sex? (20)

1 A good deal 2 A little 3 Not at all

55. Could residence life staff and programs assist you in establishing meaningful relationships with opposite sex? (21)

1 Yes 2 No 3 Uncertain

56. SHOULD residence life staff and programs assist you in establishing meaningful relationships with opposite sex? (22)

1 Yes 2 No 3 Uncertain

57. What about other students, could they benefit? (23)

1 Yes 2 No 3 Uncertain

58. What could the University do in this area? _____
- _____

7

59. How important is being able to form meaningful interpersonal relationships (friendships, etc.) with persons of the same sex, such as your roommate(s), etc.? (24)

1 Of great importance 2 Of some import 3 Of little import 4 Of no import

60. How satisfied are you with the quality of your relationships with others (same sex) at IU? (25)

1 Very satisfied 2 Somewhat satisfied 3 Somewhat dissatisfied

4 Very dissatisfied

61. How often do you expend effort or attempt to improve your relationships with your roommate, persons on your floor, center, etc.? (26)

1 Very often 2 Often 3 Occasionally 4 Never

62. To what extent has living in (name of center) increased your capacity to form meaningful interpersonal relationships with (members of same sex) such as your roommate(s), friends, etc.? (27)

1 A good deal 2 A little 3 Not at all

63. Could residence life staff and programs assist in this area? (28)

1 Yes 2 No 3 Uncertain

64. SHOULD residence life staff and programs assist in this area? (29)

1 Yes 2 No 3 Uncertain

65. What about others—could they benefit? (30)

1 Yes 2 No 3 Uncertain

66. What could the University do in this area?

67. If you had the power to improve, in general, the quality of living in your residence center, what would you do? (Probe for specificity)

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION. I REALLY APPRECIATE IT!

RESIDENCE LIFE STAFF FORM

Name _____ Position _____
Center _____

1. In your own words, what are the goals of _____ Center?

2. To what extent do you believe staff in your center are committed to the Center's goals?

3. Would you say the staff is:

_____ Highly committed _____ Moderately committed _____ Somewhat committed
_____ Not at all committed

4. Please describe the personality of the center. That is, what are the dominant characteristics, behaviors, and activities of the center's residents?

5. How satisfactory are the conditions for residents studying in their rooms?

☐ Very satisfactory ☐ Satisfactory ☐ Unsatisfactory

6. How can study conditions be improved? (What must be done, etc.)

7. How important to you is encouraging responsible behavior on the part of residents (showing respect for belongings of others, center property, studying enough, etc.)?

☐ Of great importance ☐ Of some importance ☐ Of little importance

☐ Of no importance

8. How satisfied are you with the degree to which residents of your center act responsibly?

☐ Very satisfied ☐ Somewhat satisfied ☐ Somewhat dissatisfied

☐ Very dissatisfied

9. Could residence life staff and programs increase the degree to which residents act responsibly?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Uncertain

10. Should residence life staff attempt to do so?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Uncertain

11. What suggestions do you have for the University that would help facilitate a strong sense of responsibility on the part of residents?

12. How important to you is encouraging effective communication on the part of residents in your center?
- ____ Of great importance ____ Of some importance ____ Of little importance
____ Of no importance
13. How satisfied are you with the degree to which residents of your center communicate effectively (adequately)?
- ____ Very satisfied ____ Somewhat satisfied ____ Somewhat dissatisfied
____ Very dissatisfied
14. Could residence life staff and programs increase the degree to which residents communicate effectively?
- ____ Yes ____ No ____ Uncertain
15. Should residence life staff and programs increase the degree to which residents communicate effectively?
- ____ Yes ____ No ____ Uncertain
16. What suggestions do you have for the University that would help facilitate effective communication on the part of residents?
17. How important to you is encouraging residents of your center to understand and appreciate persons from different cultures?
- ____ Of great importance ____ Of some importance ____ Of little importance
____ Of no importance
18. How satisfied are you with the degree to which residents understand and appreciate persons from different cultures?
- ____ Very satisfied ____ Somewhat satisfied ____ Somewhat dissatisfied
____ Very dissatisfied

19. Could residence life staff and programs increase the degree to which residents understand and appreciate persons from different cultures?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Uncertain
20. Should residence life staff and programs increase the degree to which residents understand and appreciate persons from different cultures?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Uncertain
21. What suggestions do you have for the University that would help facilitate an appreciation and understanding of persons from different cultures?
22. How important to you is encouraging residents to increase their tolerance of persons with lifestyles different than their own?
☐ Of great importance ☐ Of some importance ☐ Of little importance
☐ Of no importance
23. How satisfied are you with the degree to which residents are tolerant of persons with lifestyles different than their own?
☐ Very satisfied ☐ Somewhat satisfied ☐ Somewhat dissatisfied
☐ Very dissatisfied
24. Could residence life staff and programs increase the degree to which residents are tolerant of persons with lifestyles different than their own?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Uncertain
25. Should residence life staff and programs increase the degree to which residents are tolerant of persons with lifestyles different than their own?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Uncertain

26. What suggestions do you have for the University that would help facilitate tolerance of persons with different lifestyles?
27. How important to you is encouraging residents to form meaningful interpersonal relationships with members of the opposite sex?
- ____ Of great importance ____ Of some importance ____ Of little importance
____ Of no importance
28. How satisfied are you with the degree to which residents seem to have formed meaningful interpersonal relationships with members of the opposite sex?
- ____ Very satisfied ____ Somewhat satisfied ____ Somewhat dissatisfied
____ Very dissatisfied
29. Could residence life staff and programs increase the degree to which residents form meaningful interpersonal relationships with members of the opposite sex?
- ____ Yes ____ No ____ Uncertain
30. Should residence life staff and programs increase the degree to which residents form meaningful interpersonal relationships with members of the opposite sex?
- ____ Yes ____ No ____ Uncertain
31. What suggestions do you have for the University that would help facilitate residents in forming meaningful interpersonal relationships with members of the opposite sex?

32. How important to you is encouraging residents to form meaningful interpersonal relationships with persons of the same sex (roommates, etc.)?
- Of great importance Of some importance Of little importance
- Of no importance
33. How satisfied are you with the degree to which residents seem to have formed meaningful interpersonal relationships with persons of the same sex?
- Very satisfied Somewhat satisfied Somewhat dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied
34. Could residence life staff and programs increase the degree to which residents form meaningful interpersonal relationships with members of the same sex?
- Yes No Uncertain
35. Should residence life staff and programs increase the degree to which residents form meaningful interpersonal relationships with members of the same sex?
- Yes No Uncertain
36. What suggestions do you have for the University that would help facilitate residents in forming meaningful interpersonal relationships with members of the same sex?
37. If you could improve the quality of living in your residence center, what would you do? (Probe for specificity)